

CINEMA STUDIES

The Journal of the Society for Film History Research

VOLUME I

AUGUST 1961

NUMBER 3



CONTENTS

EDITORIAL

THE FIRST COMMAND FILM PERFORMANCE

by Sidney Birt Acres

WORDSWORTH DONISTHORPE

by Brian W. Coe

DIGEST OF PERIODICAL ARTICLES

AN EARLY ANGLO-DUTCH CO-PRODUCTION

by Rosemary Heaword

NOTES AND QUERIES

BOOK REVIEWS

Olive Blackham : *Shadow Puppets*

by Eric Walter White

Fritiof Billquist : *Ingmar Bergman : Teatermannen och Filmskaparen*

Ingmar Bergman : *Four Screenplays of Ingmar Bergman*
by Grete Selby

Enrico Baragli : *Cinema Cattolico : Documenti della Santa Sede sul Cinema*

by N.M.H.

THEATRE NOTEBOOK

*(including the Bulletin of the
Society for Theatre Research)*

**A QUARTERLY JOURNAL
OF THE HISTORY
AND TECHNIQUE OF THE
BRITISH THEATRE**

Edited by
Sybil Rosenfeld & Ian Kyrle Fletcher

**Volume 15 Now Issued
Price 15s. post free**

**22 BUCKINGHAM GATE
LONDON, S.W.1**

'Screen Education'

The bi-monthly journal of the
**SOCIETY FOR EDUCATION
IN FILM AND TELEVISION**

*Full details of membership
(10/- per annum)
and a free copy of
'Screen Education' from*

Miss M. B. Ward
Membership Secretary, S.E.F.T.
**57 Beresford Road
Walthamstow
London, E.17**

WARNER-PATHE DISTRIBUTORS LTD.

Warner-Pathe House, Wardour St., London, W.1.

16mm. Division Tel. GERard 5400

TIME TO REMEMBER

(Running time : 28 minutes per episode)

An absorbing, vital and completely different Series.

**A vivid recreation of the first half of the 20th Century.
A pictorial record of some of the most exciting sequences in
world history. The Boer War—Britain in the Victorian era—
Kings and Queens of Kingdoms long swept away—The story
of the First World War—Lindbergh's lone flight to Paris.
The first ten in the Series—1896-1920—are available now.
1920-1930 will be available later this year.**

(A Must for every Student of the Cinema)

Hire Fee : £1 11s. 6d. per Episode



CINEMA STUDIES

Editors :

NEVILLE MARCH HUNNINGS and JOHN GILLETT

1 Dane Street, High Holborn, W.C.1.

Published by the SOCIETY FOR FILM HISTORY RESEARCH

EDITORIAL

Once upon a time, many years ago, *Sight and Sound* used to distribute a special supplement with each issue. This took the form of an "index" to the work of a particular director and was the film equivalent of a bibliography—the French later coined the word *filmographie* and this term has now become widespread. This first series of indexes was unpretentious. They listed the works of their subject together with credits and cast details, synopses and usually some information about the release of each film, alternative titles and so on. Their great value, however, was, and is, that practically for the first time the film student was able to refer conveniently to a basic list of his subject's films. The series contained much pioneer work, and the indexes of for instance D. W. Griffith by Seymour Stern and Charles Chaplin by Theodore Huff have been of great value to scholars everywhere. Unfortunately the series ceased after eighteen indexes had appeared.

Since then the filmography has become very widespread. Articles in periodicals about a director or technician are frequently found to end with a list of his films. *Kosmorama* has been publishing filmographies for several years as a regular feature, two per issue, and has passed the half century. Indeed we have now reached the situation in which an index of filmographies would perform a useful service.

We have also perhaps reached the stage where it would be worthwhile to think carefully what a filmography can do and what form it should ideally take. Most of those which are being or have recently been published are little more than lists, appendices to articles or series of articles, giving titles, a few credits, and dates. As such they are useful, they help to put the relevant films into their chronological perspective. But they have little intrinsic merit otherwise. The first *Sight and Sound* series were valuable because of the work that went into them and the amount of this work which was embodied in the final publication.

Some years later, the British Film Institute revived the series as a separate autonomous publication, and some half-dozen issues appeared of the New Index Series in a new and more ambitious form. They were now illustrated and contained more reading (as opposed to reference) matter. This was an interesting and on the whole beneficial development. Although the contents sometimes seemed to lack the disciplined scholarship of the earlier series, the more relaxed style and more luxurious format brought in a flexibility which could be used to good purpose. The first of this new series,

Ebbe Neergaard's *Carl Dreyer*, was almost a monograph. Since these first appeared in 1950 there has been sporadic publication of similar indexes elsewhere on much the same lines: the French have developed a useful variant in the *fiche technique* or *fiche culturelle* which appear independently or in such periodicals as *Image et Son*; and a degenerate form has been published by the British Film Institute itself in connexion with programmes at the National Film Theatre devoted to the work of specific directors.

But the trend which was started and developed by these two series has recently taken a very big step forward. Two new series of monographs are to be reviewed in our next issue. The first, published in Milan, takes a single film in each issue and documents it thoroughly—script, shooting history, background, photographs, credits. The other, published in Lyon, takes a single director and documents him—filmography, bibliography, extracts from scripts, extracts from criticism, together with a long critical essay. The spiral has now taken a complete turn. We have again the singleminded discipline of the first *Sight and Sound* series, but now the material is much richer, and the approach which is still firmly based on documentation has become evaluative as well.

Underlying all this is the urgent need for basic documentation, so that the student can refer, easily and with confidence, to the background material for his study. Detailed histories are gradually appearing, one by one, of varying merit but all providing a wealth of material, and all increasing our understanding of the context in which cinema has developed. Good biographies, which are perhaps ultimately of even greater value, are appearing more slowly. But none of these normally contains any documentation; the most they have is a short appendix and an apparatus of notes, sometimes without a bibliography, sometimes even without an index! The collections of documents on the cinema issued from the Vatican and reviewed in this issue show what can be done in this field. And it is towards this that the various index series are gradually feeling. They are not, or should not be, potted biographies or potted anything, but rather basic information to aid anyone who is writing a study of a particular film-maker, whether of his work, his life, or even of one of his films.

SOCIETY FOR FILM HISTORY RESEARCH

Chairman:

JOHN MINCHINTON

Hon. Secretary:

ROSEMARY HEAWORD
3 Hollybrake
Bull Lane
Chislehurst, Kent

Hon. Treasurer:

RONALD S. RADDON
22 Byng Road
Barnet
Herts

Annual subscription £1
Full details from the Hon. Secretary

THE FIRST COMMAND FILM PERFORMANCE

By SIDNEY BIRT ACRES*

It all started when Birt Acres obtained permission to film the visit of T.R.H. Prince Edward and Princess Alexandra of Wales and the Princesses Victoria and Maud to the Cardiff Exhibition in June, 1896.

In order to film the incident, he was permitted to insert the lens of his "Kineoptikon" (as he then called it) through a small hole in the scenery lining a private avenue through which the Royal Party would pass on their way to the Exhibition. Being unable to use his view-finder under the circumstances, he waited for a signal that the arrival was imminent, and then started turning the handle of his machine.

Later on July 20th, after having made a print from the film, he sent a telegram to Prince Edward (through his Equerry, Sir Dighton Probyn) seeking permission to show it to the Public.

This brought an immediate reply saying that, as he had no means of viewing the film, he wished Birt Acres to bring the film and his machine to Marlborough House to demonstrate it. As Acres was then on holiday at Ilfracombe, N. Devon, he respectfully replied that it would be impossible for him to get to London at any reasonable hour to show the film that day. This brought another wire postponing the demonstration until the next day.

Birt Acres and his apparatus arrived early the following morning at Marlborough House, where he was met by the House Steward, Mr. Church, and his son and was introduced to H.R.H. Prince Edward (subsequently to become H.M. King Edward VII). They all proceeded to the schoolroom where it was proposed to have the film shown on that night, 21st July, 1896.

It was intended to be part of the entertainment being given to a large number of guests—Royal Personages and other notabilities from all over Europe who had been invited to London to be present at the wedding of T.R.H. Princess Maud and Prince Charles of Denmark on the following day. As this involved filling the schoolroom to capacity, with the necessity of Prince Edward sitting close up to the screen, Birt Acres respectfully pointed out to His Highness that the picture would resemble a "gravel path" from that short distance. Thus the schoolroom was abandoned, and plans were at once put into operation to erect a large marquee in the Royal grounds, and electricity was laid on for lighting it, and to feed the Projector lamp.

Mr. Cecil Hepworth (later famous as the producer of the film "Rescued by Rover") had just perfected a projection arc-lamp which he installed and operated at the performance that evening.

The first lady to arrive at the marquee that evening was H.R.H. Princess Alexandra, who seemed to bow to Birt Acres when she entered. He thought he must have been mistaken, so he appeared to ignore the incident. However, Her Highness waited to catch his eye again and she very deliberately bowed again—this time bringing Birt Acres' response. This Royal example was an indication that all the subsequent guests should do likewise, Acres was thus kept

* The son of Birt Acres.

bowing for quite some time, rather to his discomfiture as he had not expected any such recognition.

Among those present were : Their Royal Highnesses Prince and Princess of Wales, Crown Prince and Princess of Denmark, Duke and Duchess of Sparta, Prince Nicholas of Greece, Duke and Duchess of Connaught, Prince and Princess Christian of Schleswig-Holstein, Princess Victoria of Schleswig-Holstein, Princess Louise (Marchioness of Lorne) and the Marquis of Lorne, the Duchess of Albany, Princess Elizabeth of Waldeck-Pyrmont, Prince Christian of Denmark, Prince Charles of Denmark, Prince Harold of Denmark, Princess Ingeborg of Denmark, Princess Thyra of Denmark, the Duke and Duchess of York, Princess Louise (Duchess of Fife) and the Duke of Fife, Princess Victoria and Princess Maud of Wales, Prince and Princess Philip of Saxe-Coburg, Prince and Princess Frederick of Schaumburg-Lippe, and Duke of Cambridge, Prince Christian Victor of Schleswig-Holstein, Prince and Princess Edward of Saxe-Weimar, Duke of Teck, Princess Victoria of Hehenlohe-Langenburg, Countess Feodora and Helena Gleichen, Prince and Princess Adolphus of Teck, Count Gleichen, etc., making in all a total of seventy-five.

When at last all were present and the lights were turned out, there was a long drawn-out "A-a-ah" from the guests, such as one might expect from a room full of excited school children ! The programme consisted of :—

1. Capstone Parade, Ilfracombe.
2. Children Playing.
3. Great Northern Railway: Departure of an East Coast Express.
4. The Derby 1895.
5. Niagara Falls (in three tableaux).
No. 1 The Upper River just above the Falls.
No. 2 The Falls in Winter.
No. 3 The Whirlpool Rapids.
6. The German Emperor reviewing his guards previous to the opening of the Kiel Canal, June, 1895.
7. Carpenter's Shop. Scene "Refreshments."
8. The Boxing Kangaroo.
9. The hunt of a pickpocket.
10. A visit to the Zoo.
11. Yarmouth fishing boats leaving harbour.
12. Golf Extraordinary.
13. Tom Merry (Lightning Artist) drawing Mr. Gladstone.
14. Tom Merry (Lightning Artist) drawing Lord Salisbury.
15. Boxing match in two rounds by Sergt. Instructor Barrett and Sergt. Pope.
16. Highgate Tunnel.
17. Henley Regatta.
18. The Derby 1896; Clearing the Course; The Preliminary Parade; The Race; *Persimmon** wins; Wild enthusiasm, hats waving, etc.
19. Broadway, New York.
20. A "South-Wester."
21. H.R.H. The Prince of Wales, accompanied by T.R.H. the Princess of Wales, Princess Victoria and Princess Maud arriving at the Cardiff Exhibition, Cardiff, June 27th, 1896.

*N.B.—"Persimmon" was H.R.H. Prince of Wales' horse

At one point in the final picture there was a sudden—and to Birt Acres unaccountable—roar of laughter. At its conclusion Prince Edward asked Birt Acres if he would repeat the last picture, to which the reply was "Yes, if you will wait for it to be rewound." This was eagerly agreed upon. Now Acres and Hepworth had been too busy concentrating on the performance of the apparatus to follow closely the actual picture, so they tried to keep a closer watch this time.

It was discovered that the incident took place when the Royal party was arriving in the apparent seclusion of the private entrance avenue to the Cardiff Exhibition. It was a very hot day, and Prince Edward pushed his "Topper" to one side and scratched his head! This then, was the cause of the mirth of all the V.I.P.'s present, although when it was later shown to the Public—in those days of strict Victorian decorum—it brought forth scathing criticisms from some quarters of the Press!

After the demonstration the Prince congratulated Birt Acres on his achievement and showed great interest in the "Kineoptikon," although he did not seem to approve of the name. He suggested it should in future be called the "Cinematoscope" which of course in turn suggested its present name of "Cinematograph."

The Prince presented Birt Acres with a handsome diamond and sapphire tie pin to commemorate the occasion and gave him *carte blanche* to take any pictures he wished on the following day—the day of the Royal Wedding—in any of the Royal precincts. He was able to obtain some very good pictures, including the departure of the Royal Couple on their Honeymoon. Thus ended the first Royal Command Performance of Films.

WORDSWORTH DONISTHORPE

By BRIAN W. COE*

One of the lesser-known English pioneers of cinematography, Wordsworth Donisthorpe, a barrister by profession, spent at least twenty years on experimental work on the problems of taking and reproducing moving pictures. His first patent, No. 4344, which received provisional protection only, was filed on the 9th November, 1876, and was headed: 'Improvements in apparatus for taking a succession of photographic pictures and for exhibiting such pictures.' The object of the invention was described as follows:

"This invention has for its object to facilitate the taking of a succession of photographic pictures at equal intervals of time, in order to record the changes taking place in or the movement of the object being photographed, and also by means of a succession of pictures so taken of any moving object to give to the eye a representation of the object in continuous movement as it appeared when being photographed."

In order to achieve this, Donisthorpe suggested a camera in which plates were rapidly changed behind the taking lens, which would be covered by a screen while the plates were moving. He stated 'The mechanism for moving the plates and for moving the

*Lecturer in the Kodak Lecture Service.

screen is driven at a uniform rate, so that the plates are exposed one after the other at uniform intervals of time. . . . Apparatus arranged as above described may be employed for obtaining a record of the movements of . . . objects and may be used either for photographing objects direct or in conjunction with microscopes or telescopes.'

He went on to state that the resulting negative plates could be printed in succession on a band of paper, which could be viewed, if short enough, in a zoetrope, or wound from one cylinder to another at uniform speed, 'any ordinary means being used for ensuring that each picture shall only be exposed momentarily to the observer.'

Although probably impractical, the patent reveals that Donisthorpe understood the essential problems of cinematography. Following the introduction of Edison's phonograph, and subsequent articles on it in 1878 in the *Scientific American* and *Nature*, Donisthorpe wrote to the latter periodical a letter which is here quoted in full, as it describes the line along which he was working :

"The article from the *Scientific American* on the phonograph, which is quoted in *Nature* XVII, page 190, concludes as follows : 'It is already possible, by ingenious optical contrivances, to throw stereoscopic photographs of people on screens in full view of an audience. Add the talking phonograph to counterfeit their voices and it would be difficult to carry the illusion of real presence much further.' Ingenious as this suggested combination is, I believe I am in a position to cap it. By combining the phonograph with the Kinesigraph I will undertake not only to produce a talking picture of Mr. Gladstone, which, with motionless lips and unchanged expression shall positively recite his latest anti-Turkish speech in his own voice and tone. Not only this, but the life-size photograph shall itself move and gesticulate precisely as he did when making the speech, the words and gestures corresponding as in real life. Surely this is an advance on the conception of the *Scientific American* !

"The mode in which I effect this is described in the accompanying provisional specification which may be briefly summed up thus : instantaneous photographs of bodies or groups of bodies in motion are taken at equal short intervals—say $\frac{1}{4}$ or $\frac{1}{2}$ seconds—the exposure of the plate occupying not more than $\frac{1}{4}$ second. After fixing, the prints from the plates are taken one below another on a long strip or ribbon of paper. The strip is wound from one cylinder to another so as to cause the several photographs to pass before the eye successively at the same intervals of time as those at which they were taken.

"Each picture as it passes the eye is instantaneously lighted up by an electric spark. Thus the picture is made to appear stationary while the people or things in it appear to move as in nature. I need not enter more into detail beyond saying that if the intervals between the presentation of successive pictures are found to be too short the gaps can be filled up by duplicates or triplicates of each succeeding print. This will not perceptibly alter the general effect. I think it will be admitted that by this means a drama

acted by daylight or magnesium light may be recorded and re-acted on the screen or sheet of a magic lantern, and with the assistance of the phonograph the dialogues may be repeated in the very voices of the actors.

"When this is actually accomplished the photography of colours will alone be wanting to render the representation absolutely complete, and for this we shall not, I trust, have long to wait." (*Nature*, XVII, p. 242, January 24th, 1878).

It is probable that Donisthorpe's experiments had some small success, although the use of glass plates in the camera was the major impediment to satisfactory results. When a flexible support became available—the Eastman stripping paper film—Donisthorpe continued his experiments which culminated in the filing of a patent No. 12,921, on the 15th August 1889. A joint patent with William Carr Crofts, who made the drawings and supervised construction of the apparatus, it describes apparatus in which 'the pictures are produced upon a sensitive film or surface carried by a long roll of paper or other material.' After mentioning the principle of persistence of vision on which the apparatus was based, it described a camera which exposed pictures at the rate of from 8 to 6 a second, and a projector which, working on the same principles, could be used to show a moving picture on a screen. During exposure or projection the film was rendered stationary, relative to the lens, by a most ingenious device, while movement of the film between exposures was covered by a rotating disc or cylindrical shutter. "In this way we cause the spectator's eye to receive the impression of each picture as the preceding picture is fading from the retina, which retains it until replaced in its turn by the impression of the succeeding picture, and so on. Thus the blank intervals between the successive exposures of the pictures are not appreciated by the eye; and the general impression produced is that of continuous motion corresponding to the successive positions of the moving objects."

The film travelled from the feed roller to the take-up roller at a constant speed past the lens, being temporarily rendered stationary relative to the lens by a reciprocating device that carried the whole film transport mechanism upwards at the same speed as the downward-moving film, during which time the shutter uncovered the lens. During the period between exposures, the downward movement of the film was doubled by the downward movement of the transport mechanism—the film thus moving on, relative to the lens, the length of one picture.

Although somewhat unusual, the principle is theoretically quite sound; that it worked in practice is amply demonstrated by nine surviving frames of celluloid film, exposed during 1890 in Trafalgar Square, London and now in the possession of the Kodak Museum, Harrow.

Although the apparatus never appears to have been publicly demonstrated, references to it appear in photographic journals published in later years. The *Photographic News* in 1891 reported 'We have been informed that already series of photographs of moving objects have been taken with the instrument at a rate of from 8 to 12 per second. . . . The experiments show that owing to the comparatively long time during which each successive picture can be kept absolutely stationary . . . a maximum speed of 12 per second need not be exceeded in order to secure the effect of continuous and natural motion.' (*Photo. News*, 35, p. 345, June 12th, 1891.)

During 1896 and 1897 there was much discussion in English photographic journals on the invention of cinematography; Wordsworth Donisthorpe on several occasions wrote letters describing the work he had done. His first letter states apropos the Kinesigraph: "As long ago as 1877 I had a model made, and the whole thing was described in *Nature* in almost the identical words in which Mr. Edison announced his 'coming' marvel to an expectant world in 1892." (*British Journal of Photography*, XLIII, p. 607, September 18th 1896). In a longer letter in 1897 he described the part played by Crofts who, he said "was a good draughtsman, and I agreed to give him an interest in my invention in consideration of his making the working drawings and supervising the construction of the instrument." In the same letter he stated: "One or two millionaires were . . . approached with a view to the commercial development of the patent. Amongst others, Mr. Crofts and myself submitted the matter to two 'experts' selected by Sir George Newnes, to pronounce on its merits. One (I afterwards learnt), was an artist, a painter who was as ignorant of the physical sciences as Noah's grandmother, and the other was, I believe, a magic-lantern maker. I need hardly tell you that both these 'experts' reported adversely. They agreed that the idea was wild, visionary and ridiculous, and that the only result of attempting to photograph motion would be an indescribable blur. What could Sir George Newnes do in the face of such 'expert' testimony?" (*British Journal of Photography*, XLIV, p. 175, March 12th 1897).

In a further letter Donisthorpe suggested that most of the shortcomings of contemporary cinematograph apparatus could be overcome by adopting his system of film transport "In (this) particular, my own invention is so vastly the superior—even now—of all that have come after it that I am surprised that practical men have not adopted it." (*British Journal of Photography*, XLIV, p. 207, March 1897).

In the years following, the name of Wordsworth Donisthorpe became forgotten, and he is rarely mentioned in works on the history of cinematography. Although his direct contribution to the introduction of the motion picture is small, he deserves recognition as a pioneer who possessed the knowledge and foresight necessary to realize the moving picture, but lacked the means finally to accomplish the production of satisfactory apparatus. Had the 'experts' appointed by Sir George Newnes been less damning in their opinions, Wordsworth Donisthorpe might well have been the first publicly to project moving pictures, and thus perhaps to advance the introduction of cinematography by several years.

DIGEST OF PERIODICAL ARTICLES

A number of articles have appeared in periodicals published since the beginning of 1961, which may be of interest to those engaged in research into the cinema. A brief list of some of these is given below, divided very simply into three categories: (a) articles on individuals, whether film makers, actors, writers or others; (b) articles on developments or trends in particular countries; and (c) articles on particular subjects relating to the cinema. They are set out in alphabetical order of subject-matter.

A. Individuals

ARNHEIM, Rudolf

Rudolf Arnheim: il cinema e l'estetica by Maria Grazia Sacchi, in "Centrofilm" (Turin) No. 21 (May 1961) pp. 3-35.

An important essay analysing Arnheim's theories and containing a three-page bibliography of his writings.

BARBARO, Umberto

Barbaro e il personaggio 'Perpetua' by Libero Solaroli, in "Filmcritica" (Rome) No. 108 (April 1961) pp. 182-186.

An account of Barbaro's writings.

DREYER, Carl Th.

Den tabte og genfundne Dreyer-film by Vladimir Matusevitch, in "Kosmorama" (Copenhagen) No. 53 (April 1961) pp. 133-138.

EISENSTEIN, Sergei Mihailovich

I ricordi di Hollywood by S. M. Eisenstein, in "Filmcritica" (Rome) No. 106-107 (February/March 1961) pp. 69-74.

One path to colour: an autobiographical fragment by S. M. Eisenstein, in "Sight and Sound" (London) Vol. 30 No. 2 (Spring 1961) pp. 84-86.

Un cinéaste soviétique en Sorbonne by S. M. Eisenstein, in "Cahiers du Cinema" (Paris) No. 117 (March 1961) pp. 2-11.

The above are three articles out of the many posthumous writings left by Eisenstein and now gradually being published.

GARSON, Greer

Greer Garson by Herbert G. Luft, in "Films in Review" (New York) Vol. XII No. 3 (March 1961) pp. 152-164.

HOWE, James Wong

James Wong Howe by Jack Jacobs, in "Films in Review" (New York) Vol. XII No. 4 (April 1961) pp. 215-232.

LENIN, V. I.

Obraz V. I. Lenina na ekrane by A. Groshev, in "Iskusstvo Kino" (Moscow) (March 1961) pp. 102-109.

The image of Lenin on the screen.

LINCOLN, Abraham

Lincoln on the screen by Robert C. Roman, in "Films in Review" (New York) Vol. XII No. 2 (February 1961) pp. 87-101.

LOMBARD, Carole

Carole Lombard by Homer Dickens,
in "Films in Review" (New York) Vol. XII No. 2 (February
1961) pp. 70-86.

SENNETT, Mack

De mest levende billeder by Poul Malmkjaer,
in "Kosmorama" (Copenhagen) No. 52 (February 1961) pp.
100-106.

TOURNEUR, Maurice

Maurice Tourneur by George Geltzer,
in "Films in Review" (New York) Vol. XII No. 4 (April 1961)
pp. 193-213.

TWAIN, Mark

Mark Twain on the screen by Robert C. Roman,
in "Films in Review" (New York) Vol. XII No. 1 (January
1961) pp. 20-23.

B. Countries

DENMARK

Dania Biofilm Kompagni

Da Gyldendal filmede eller Dania Biofilm Kompagni's historie
by Marguerite Engberg,
in "Kosmorama" (Copenhagen) No. 53 (April 1961) pp. 139-
144.

INDIA

Uno sguardo al cinema indiano by Charles Cadoux,
in "Bianco e Nero" (Rome) Vol. XXII No. 1 (January 1961)
pp. 11-39.

A useful historical survey and analysis of the Indian film.

RUSSIA

Sovetskii istoriko-revolutsionnyi fil'm by N. Vasil'eva,
in "Iskusstvo Kino" (Moscow) (May 1961) pp. 114-118.

The Soviet historical-revolutionary film.

C. Subjects

COMEDY

Autopsie du gag. II—Le gag et les trois unités by François Mars,
in "Cahiers du Cinéma" (Paris) No. 116 (February 1961) pp.
28-38.

Autopsie du gag. III—Le gag et les trois unités (suite) by
François Mars,
in "Cahiers du Cinéma" (Paris) No. 117 (March 1961) pp. 32-
40.

PSYCHOLOGY

Influenza psicologica del film by Sandro Ascarelli,
in "Filmcritica" (Rome) No. 108 (April 1961) pp. 191-204.

AN EARLY ANGLO-DUTCH CO-PRODUCTION

By ROSEMARY HEAWORD*

Judging from entries in the *Kinematograph Year Books*, the Granger-Binger partnership was of very short duration, listed only for the years 1922 and 1923 in the "British Studios" Section, as follows: "Granger-Binger, Haarlem, Holland; London Office: Granger's Exclusives, 19 Wardour Street, W.1." The only film made by this company, which we know by name, is *The Black Tulip*. Its British trade show took place in London on September 7th, 1921, at 11.15 a.m. at the Shaftesbury Pavilion, and during the rest of the year there were ten provincial trade shows, details of which appear on p. 9 of *The Kinematograph Weekly* (1/9/21). *The Black Tulip* was hailed as "a good all-round production for better class halls,"¹ with authentic settings and fine visual qualities. Also praised was a cast including Gerald McCarthy, Zoe Palmer, Eduard Verkade, Dio Huysmans, Frank Dane, Coen Hissink, Harry Walter, Laurens Ezerman. The producers were evidently concerned about the quality of this film. Most of the shooting took place in the middle of the Netherlands' tulip growing country and the novelist, Marjorie Bowen, was commissioned to compile the titles. This we know from a photograph in the collection of Bert Langdon, which shows her reading the film script at the Granger-Binger studios.² However, apart from captions in fan magazines of a very sketchy nature, there seems to be little other British material on this film.

Though useful as leads, such facts do not reveal the character of this co-production. How and why did A. G. Granger and Maurits Binger get together in the first place? And why only for such a short time? The career of Granger himself may furnish some clues. Up to 1925, his potted biography was a regular feature of the *Kinematograph Year Book* "Who's What" section. Augustus George Granger, born at Clifton, Bristol, May 25th, 1880, was educated at Doddington College, Kent. During the South African War, he served as a private in the City of London Brigade. Later, returning to Britain, he entered "the kinematograph business as an exhibitor at the Old St. James' Hall, Plymouth." Then he became manager of the Old Court Theatre, Tottenham Court Road, London. About three years later, he was supervising four houses at the Potteries for Cinema House Ltd., soon afterwards going as manager to the Majestic, Stoke-on-Trent. Here in 1918 he started the firm GRANGER'S EXCLUSIVES LIMITED, of which he was managing director. He then attempted to establish himself as a film maker in association with, or through, the following companies: Granger-Binger, Granger-Davidson, Granger, Vita and Legrand. For a long time he was treasurer of the North Staffordshire Branch of the C.E.A. and later also a member of the K.R.S. "Club: Engineers; Address: Claremont, Harpfields, Stoke-on-Trent." Before its collapse, Granger's Exclusives had established branches throughout the British Isles, but seemed unable to support the ambitions of its

* B.A., A.K.C. Hon. Secretary of The Society for Film History Research.

¹ *Kinematograph Weekly*, September 15th, 1921, p. 51, pp. 55-56.

² The film was publicly released in September, 1922.

manager when he took on, in addition, a programme of full-length feature production. His creditors met at the K.R.S. offices on November 6th, 1924. A full account of the business can be found in the *Kinematograph Year Book*, 1925 (p. 196). From 1918, up to date, Granger's Exclusives had made a loss of £173,990; so the meeting "eventually resolved that the voluntary liquidation of the company should be confirmed with Mr. Franklin as liquidator, together with a committee of creditors."

Granger must then be considered mainly as a distributor. What was his role in relation to Maurits Binger? And was the undertaking made for just this one film? Considering the brief duration of their partnership, it might seem that Granger was after good facilities and location for *The Black Tulip*. He was an influential renter and in return could offer the Netherlander wide distribution in the British Isles. Seen in the light of Granger's other co-productions, this becomes more probable. He does not appear to have had a permanent production unit of his own, thus working in association with a succession of companies. So far it is not possible to say whether he eventually intended to set up a permanent unit, but his career would suggest a preference for rather ad hoc methods. Could this be an attempt to avoid the expense of overheads in between each film? And, in the Granger-Binger relationship, who took the initiative? Which came first: Granger wanting facilities, or Binger planning to break into foreign markets, a motive behind many modern international co-productions? It would be interesting to get a clearer picture of their motives. There is evidence of lively Anglo-Dutch co-operation since 1914,³ up to the period 1919-1921 (which resulted in *The Black Tulip*). One could further speculate as to whether contact between English and Dutch film makers would have led to more co-productions had not the Dutch film industry suffered a severe set-back when fire destroyed the Hollandia Film Studios at Haarlem in 1924. Insufficient documentation can only end in questions, but it is one step further to know what questions to ask.

3 cf "Film Research in the Netherlands," Jan de Vaal, *Cinema Studies*, I, i, pp. 11-12.

NOTES AND QUERIES

ANGLO-BRAZILIAN CINEMATOGRAPH COMPANY. In 1916 there was created in Brazil a production company called The Anglo-Brazilian Cinematograph Company. They produced at least one film with Brazilian actors which was called *Entre a Arte e o Amor*. The name of the Chairman of the company was Charles F. MacLaren; the Technical Director was William Rupert Blake; and the Manager was Major Alfred Kans. I should be grateful to receive any information about this company.

P. E. SALES GOMES.

ARTHUR MELBOURNE-COOPER. Well-known in the trade as "ALPHA OF ST. ALBANS," Mr. Melbourne-Cooper frequently operated under the name of "CINE SYNDICATE" of which he and William Jeapes were the founder members; together they 'worked' the Animated Pictures at the Empire Theatre in Leicester Square. He did much free-lance work for the Warwick Trading Company, was a familiar figure at most of the main events of the day, and was recognised as one of Charles Urban's chief men. He was also engaged by the British Mutoscope and Biograph Company, and his work for them also included studio portraiture (mainly of theatrical celebrities) and the advancement of the Kinora.

Alpha productions are found scattered throughout the lists and catalogues of his contemporaries, who all too frequently substituted titles of their own. Thus *The Motor Pirate* when issued by Cosmopolitan Productions became "The Raid of the Armoured Motor Car," and by Butchers "The Automobile Thieves"; *Professor Bunkum's Performing Flea* became "The Adventures of a Flea" (Walturdaw), "The Showman's Treasure" (Graphic), and "The Wandering Flea" (Pathé); *Winning a Pair of Gloves* became "Winning the Gloves" (Williamson). Hundreds of copies were also shipped abroad and Alpha productions are included in lists published by various agents in other countries.

Mr. Melbourne-Cooper was also commissioned by Butchers to make several puppet films, and these went out as "Empire" Productions. Butchers eventually acquired the whole existing stock of Alpha negatives, and many of these were reissued as ACME Productions.

Towards the latter part of 1912, Melbourne-Cooper launched a new company, Kinema Industries, with Mark Melford and his company of artistes. And in association with Andrew Heron and Major Freeth (of "Science Siftings") a number of "Anglo-Belgian Productions" were made. It is recalled by present survivors who worked with him during this period that Mr. Melbourne-Cooper was again indulging his old love of animating puppets, until the outbreak of the Great War brought Kinema Industries to a swift and violent end.

I should be glad to receive any help or information which might assist in tracing letters, documents, handbills, posters, or any other evidence as to Mr. Melbourne-Cooper's work in films prior to the Great War.

AUDREY WADOWSKA.

BOOK REVIEWS

Shadow Puppets by Olive Blackham. London: Barrie & Rockcliff, 1960. 198 pp. 35s.

Mankind has always been haunted by the power of the shadow. Since the allegory of the cave in Plato's Republic, the projection of shadows, and indeed the creation of ideal forms from actual shadows, has exercised the imagination of many persons; and this may help to account for the powerful influence of the shadow theatre during past centuries in various countries of the East, and of the cinema in our own day.

In *Shadow Puppets*, Olive Blackham has set out to do two things—first, to give an account of the shadow theatre in certain parts of the world (particularly China, Java, Turkey, Greece, France and England) and then to provide practical information on the making and manipulation of the various puppets employed and on the production of shadow plays.

Although India and Persia are deliberately omitted from her survey, she says enough about the rest of Asia to show that in the course of time the shadow theatre has tended to travel westwards. The earliest European manifestations seem to have been the black and white *ombres chinoises* that became popular in Paris and London in the 18th and 19th centuries; but although some of them, particularly those by Salis and Rivière, must have had moments of effective fantasy, due largely to the ingenious lighting employed, their theatrical significance seems to have been slight, and this judgment is confirmed by the version of *Le Pont Cassé* or *The Broken Bridge* printed by Miss Blackham in an appendix. This little piece was a favourite with French and English audiences for well over a century and formed the backbone of many a varied *ombres chinoises* bill: but even when allowance has been made for the execrable translation from the French and the stupid, reiterated misprints in the musical score, it seems a trivial thing—of no greater theatrical interest than one of the minor Elizabethan jigs.

Those who are interested in the dramatic potential of shadow puppets should turn to Greece, where during the last hundred years the Turkish Karagöz Theatre has been adopted and naturalised, and in its new form has become a colourful popular theatre with a wide repertory of shadow plays. Although there are differing accounts of the origins of Karagöz, it seems likely that he was an actual person—a quick-witted, garrulous, dark-eyed Armenian (Karagöz in Turkish means “dark-eyed” and denotes a gypsy) living in Asia Minor about the end of the 18th century. His exploits captured the imagination of the Turkish public to such an extent that they became the stock-in-trade of the shadow theatre and were built up into a kind of *commedia dell'arte* with Karagöz playing the part of an oriental Harlequin, witty, resourceful, and always ready with gay, impudent and frequently obscene repartee. When this Turkish theatre was transplanted to Greece about 1860, the Greeks adopted Karagöz (rechristened Karanghiosi) and the various Turkish characters that usually appeared with him, and added other characters of their own. The comedies were rewritten—or, rather, reimprovised—by the Greek shadow theatre players to suit Athenian taste; and new dramatic material was utilised, particularly patriotic stories of the prowess of Klephts and the War of Independence.

The existence of this important repertory of original Karanghiosi plays is not widely known outside Greece. Usually shadow shows are based on old material, especially fairy stories and tales of fantasy, and the result is a kind of *pastiche*. This is to be seen in the unique silhouette films of Lotte Reiniger (accorded a chapter of their own in Miss Blackham's book) which are at their best when they can present their story within the stylised convention of a baroque or rococo setting. But if in the future the shadow theatre is to play an important part in the cinema and on television, whether in black and white or in colour, the potentialities of the medium need to be more thoroughly explored than has been the case before, and here the example of the Greek Karanghiosi Theatre, with its

imaginative use of screen presentation in colour, and its capacity to absorb new characters, new situations and new ideas, should provide a stimulating challenge.

To anyone wishing to experiment by using shadow theatre technique in cartoon films and television feature programmes, Miss Blackham's book provides a useful historical background and an important mine of practical suggestions and tips.

ERIC WALTER WHITE.

Ingmar Bergman: teatermannen och filmskaparen by Fritiof Billquist. Stockholm: Natur och Kultur, 1960. 279 pp. 22 Kr. (paper covers), 27 Kr. (bound).

Four screenplays of Ingmar Bergman translated from the Swedish by Lars Malmström and David Kushner. London: Secker & Warburg, 1960. 330 pp. 42s.

The Swedish actor Fritiof Billquist is obviously a great admirer of Bergman and his book is a praiseworthy piece of research into the 42-year-old director's life and work. Since Bergman's art and place in film history are not solely Swedish but international the book fills a need for information conveniently collected and merits translation into English for the benefit of a wider public. Bergman's life is presented chronologically, including his childhood in the family home in Stockholm and his introduction into theatrical circles. Bergman himself claims 'Of all people in my life my parents have meant most to me' and sums up his childhood 'When you are born and bred in a parson's home you get an early opportunity to look behind the wings of life and death. . . . The devil was an early acquaintance of mine.' His later life is not dealt with at length: he seems to live only in the theatre or the film studio, yet has found time for a succession of wives and half-a-dozen children.

The book concentrates on his achievements in the theatre. All his stage productions are dealt with, from his earliest efforts as a 19-year-old student directing amateur performances to the latest production at the Malmö Stadsteater and his triumphs in London with *Urfaust* and in Paris with Hjalmar Bergman's *Sagan*. His stage career is followed in considerable detail, including extracts from reviews and interviews with Bergman and statements by him.

It will be a disappointment to many readers that more space is not devoted to Bergman's films, but, according to Billquist, he regards the theatre as his profession and the cinema as his passion: "The cinema is like a woman, a beautiful, capricious, lusty and spirited lady in the prime of life, but although it is pleasant to be her lover, she is a mistress one can do without. The theatre is a faithful wife to me.' However, the films are all conscientiously listed, with extracts from the scripts. About film making he says, 'Always be entertaining. The audience has a right to be gripped by a vital experience, and it is my duty to supply that experience. In doing so, I find my self-justification. This doesn't mean that I can prostitute myself: I must always follow my artistic conscience.' His method of working on stage and on film is vividly described, including the almost cruel driving of his actors, reminiscent of Dreyer.

Bergman is firmly rooted in Sweden: 'Leaving Sweden is the last thing I would ever do. I want to be active here, where I have my roots. . . . I start shaking and get a stomach ache when I sit down in a plane that goes further south than Copenhagen.' In addition to 30 films and 80 stage productions Bergman has written 15 plays, few of which have been performed, and after *Jungfrukällan* (*The Virgin Spring*) and *Djävulens Öga* (*The Devil's eye*) we shall see his first colour film. Billquist quotes other critics rather than attempt his own evaluation of Bergman's prolific activity but, making good use of interviews and conversations, he has assembled a valuable collection of material to assist in the formation of our own opinions. An English edition of the book should provide an index and a bibliography to accompany the adequately reproduced selection of stills.

In the *Four screenplays* we come to grips with the works themselves, ready to fill the gaps between imperfectly remembered subtitles with the words of the master. But these are not literary works, they are the skeletons of films, a series of instructions concerning locations in space, time and emotions. 'Film,' says Bergman in his introduction, 'has nothing to do with literature.' The script is the nearest he can get to 'a kind of notation which would enable me to put on paper all the shades and tones of my vision.' His work in the theatre and on writing his own plays and screenplays might be expected to lead to an emphasis on dialogue, but despite his contention that 'the writing of the script . . . compels me to prove logically the validity of my ideas' when making a film he must make an emotional impact by visual means. His most important technique is that of endowing a film with rhythm: 'film,' he says, 'is mainly rhythm; it is inhalation and exhalation in continuous sequence. . . . Music works in the same fashion . . . there is no art form that has so much in common with film as music. Both affect our emotions directly, but via the intellect.'

Bergman the writer provides the intellectual background against which Bergman the director makes his visual appeal to the emotions, and Bergman the director leaves behind all thoughts of logical validity and literary effect. 'I am really a conjuror, since cinematography is based on deception of the human eye. . . . I use an apparatus which is constructed to take advantage of a certain human weakness, an apparatus with which I can sway my audience in a highly emotional manner.' Bergman performs his tricks with a team of actors and technicians of unique continuity in the history of the cinema and with a technique developed from the distinct Swedish tradition. He tells how he learnt film making from Alf Sjöberg and Lorens Marmstedt. Later, Dr. Dymling of Svensk Filmindustri gave him the opportunity to make films unhampered by commercial considerations.

Bergman's introduction is a rich source of hints for the understanding of the films. *Smiles of a summer night*, which in 1956 won him international awards, is simply a comedy of manners. *The Seventh Seal*, that brilliant evocation of Europe torn by religious war, plague and fear and persecution of witchcraft proves to be the story of the simplicity of Jof the clown and his family symbolically overcoming death. Bergman gives free rein to the creatures of his imagination on an epic scale in *The Seventh Seal* and on a more personal level in *Wild Strawberries*, moving from Christian symbol-

ism into psychoanalysis. In *The Face* Bergman, in the guise of Vogler the mesmerist, explores his own role as conjuror and illusionist. With his apparatus Vogler brings everyone in the film under his power, although he himself only survives by a trick with a corpse and a box with a false bottom, and then moves on to present his show to the king.

Unfortunately these plays have been published in an American translation which has numerous inaccurate renderings of the Swedish, allows 'cute' to be used in *The Face*, set in 1846, and is illustrated by a poor selection of stills badly reproduced.

GRETE SELBY.

Cinema Cattolico : Documenti della Santa Sede sul Cinema compiled by Enrico Baragli S. J. Rome : Edizioni "La Civiltà Cattolica," 1959. 296 pp. 1,500 lire ("Catholic Cinema : Documents of the Holy See on the Cinema"). Supplement to the above. 16 pp. 100 lire.

The attitude of the Roman Catholic Church towards the cinema has been of great importance to the film industry ever since the formation of the Legion of Decency in the U.S.A. in 1933. Little serious attention had been paid to the new art by the senior clergy before then. References had been made in Papal pronouncements, but they were sparse and usually took the form of individual paragraphs in letters or speeches on other wider subjects. The first such reference was made in 1912, forbidding the use of the cinematograph in churches; and in 1929 and again in 1930 the two Encyclicals *Divini Illius Magistri* and *Casti Connubii* both contained fairly important references to the cinema. But undoubtedly the action of the American bishops set an example which the Vatican was swift to perceive and follow. The great Encyclical *Vigilanti Cura*, which was published in June 1936, paid tribute to the Legion of Decency before going on to define in detail the Church's attitude to the cinema and the practical means by which its influence could be exerted to encourage moral and inhibit immoral films.

Numerous speeches and letters followed, addressed to groups of film executives, authors and others. The Office Catholique International du Cinéma had been formed by a number of national groups in 1928, and in 1948 the Vatican decided itself to create a Pontifical Commission to co-ordinate and oversee the work which was being carried out in different countries under *Vigilanti Cura*. The Commission was reorganised in 1952 and again in 1954 when it became the Pontifical Commission for the Cinema, Radio and Television. A year later came an important speech in two parts on the Ideal Cinema ("Il Film Ideale nell'Insegnamento del Vicario di Cristo"). This was followed in 1957 by the second great Encyclical *Miranda Prorsus* and in 1959 by the *Motu Proprio 'Boni Pastoris'*, the first major pronouncement on this subject by Pope John XXIII.

The major Acts had already been published mostly in annotated editions as well as in the *Osservatore Romano*. In particular, the Pontifical Commission for the Cinema, Radio and Television published in 1955 an invaluable compendium of the documents of the Holy See and Episcopate concerning the cinema, mostly in their original language only, entitled *Le Cinéma dans l'Enseignement de l'Eglise*.

Father Baragli had, therefore, set himself an unenviable task when he undertook to produce another collection of these documents, for he was bound to be duplicating much of the work of the Pontifical Commission in 1955. That he has succeeded is due in large part to the great care he has taken in setting out the documents and to his scrupulous regard for accuracy and proper references. The two books supplement each other and are essential to anyone wishing to study the relations between the Roman Catholic Church and the cinema.

The author has in his book, and its little supplement, reprinted in their original language and in Italian translation the texts of 65 documents. Most of these, except for the last twenty or so, can also be found in the previous collection; but notable additions are the statutes of the three Pontifical Commissions as well as *Miranda Prorsus* and *Boni Pastoris*. The supplement brings the collection up to February 1959, four years later than the previous one.

Although this book would be worth having for the extra documents alone, it has three further features which increase its usefulness. Firstly, it has an index. Secondly, its "table of contents" takes the form of an annotated chronology of the documents with general notes on the attitude to the cinema during each Pontificate from Leo XIII onwards. This is extraordinarily useful in giving a general picture of the development of pontifical attitudes towards the cinema and is particularly helpful to anyone who is studying the subject from a historical viewpoint.

But perhaps the most original aspect of Father Baragli's book is the last section—Part III—in which he has compiled a "systematic index" entitled "Il cinema nel magistero e nella disciplina ecclesiastica." In ten chapters he has compiled an analytical account of the Church's teachings on the cinema referring for each statement to the appropriate section or sections of the texts set out earlier. The main value of this is clearly to the clergy in their task of guiding their flocks on the right path, and on this aspect the present reviewer is not qualified to give an opinion. It is also, however, extremely useful to the scholar as a summary view of those teachings, and provides a helpful gloss on the texts as well as an aid to the mastery of other commentaries on the Church and the cinema.

The text is clear and well set out. Citation is facilitated by consecutive numbering of each paragraph of the texts throughout the book, and the numbering of the paragraphs in the original texts is also given. This is an advantage when the author has only reprinted relevant extracts as, for example, in *Casti Connubii*. Cross-references are frequently used, and the reader is amply referred to the official publications in which the texts originally appeared.

N.M.H.